

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GRAZING FEE REVIEW AND
EVALUATION

HON. ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a report prepared by three national industry groups: the Public Lands Council, the National Cattlemen's Association and the National Wool Growers Association in response to the recently released report from the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on Grazing fees as required under the Public Rangelands Improvements Act of 1978. I commend the report to my House colleagues.

DRAFT LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY COMMENTS ON THE GRAZING FEE REVIEW AND EVALUATION: A REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

INTRODUCTION

The final "Grazing Fee Review and Evaluation" report from the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture is a grave disappointment to the National cattlemen's Association, the National Wool Growers Association, and the Public Lands Council—the three national organizations which represent livestock operators who utilize the federal rangelands for grazing purposes.

None of the five alternative fee systems examined in the final report are an improvement over the current fee system that is embodied in the Public Rangelands Improvements Act of 1978 (PRIA). Therefore, we believe the PRIA formula should be retained as the best method of determining the fair market value of grazing on these lands and as the best method of fostering good management of these land for multiple-use values.

In this paper we examine what is wrong with these five alternatives and with some of the changes suggested in the Report for the PRIA formula.

Three of the five alternatives are flawed because they are based on a study that is invalid. The study—an "appraisal" of private rents paid for western grazing pastures—violates standard rules of statistics and economics. We discuss below why this appraisal study cannot be used to determine the fair market value of public grazing forage.

The three alternatives utilizing figures based on, or derived from, the appraisal are: (1) the Modified PRIA Fee System, (2) the Combined Value Fee System, and (3) the Modified Market Value Fee System.

A fourth alternative in the Final Report is the Competitive Bid Fee System which, for reasons discussed below, would require a drastic and unwise departure from the current multiple-use and sustained yield approach to public land management. In addition, bidding would destabilize the Western livestock industry, as we explain below. (This alternative would also establish "a minimum acceptable bid." Whether that

minimum would be based on an amount from the appraisal study or some other source is not made clear.)

The fifth alternative is the PRIA-Updated Base Value Fee System. The problem that we have with this alternative is with the two ways a new index invented in this report—called an Input Cost Index (ICI)—is used: (1) to change or "update" the base value in the PRIA formula, and (2) as a substitute for the current Prices Paid Index. We also question the proposal to divide the Beef Cattle Price Index by the ICI (rather than subtract).

Since the ICI is also used in the Modified PRIA Fee System and in the Combined Value Fee System (and is another reason we disagree with those two systems), we will show why the ICI is not what the Final Report purports it is. We disagree with the assertion in chapter 3 of the Final Report that the ICI is superior to the PPI or that it is simply a "technical modification" of the PRIA formula.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to acknowledge and thank the following economists for their help to us in analyzing the technical aspects of the Final Report: John Fowler, New Mexico State University; Frederic W. Obermiller, Oregon State University; and Darwin B. Neilson, Utah State University. However, the statements and conclusions in this paper are solely the responsibility of the National Cattlemen's Association, the National Wool Growers Association, and the Public Lands Council. This paper does not necessarily represent—nor does it purport to represent—the views of these economists.

HIGHER FEES BASED ON MYTHS

The final report by the Secretaries contains five alternatives to the existing PRIA formula fee system. All alternatives to the existing system would result in higher grazing fees, with the magnitude of the fee increase varying among alternatives. Nowhere in the report is a rational given for considering only those alternatives which would lead to higher fees. The question "why should grazing fees be increased?" can be answered only by supposition.

We suspect that pressure to increase grazing fees on public lands administered by the USDA Forest Service (FS) and USDI Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the result of two popular misconceptions. First, fee receipts do not cover the costs of administering FS and BLM range management programs. Thus, for purposes of cost-recovery grazing fees should be increased. Second, the existing system results in fees that are not consistent with private grazing land rental rates. Thus, fees should be increased because those ranchers who graze livestock on public rangelands have an undue financial advantage and unfairly profit from their grazing privileges.

DISPELLING THE MYTHS

Like most popular misconceptions, these two myths have deep roots and continue to persist even though both logic and available data prove them to be invalid. Why do they persist? The answer lies in the "hidden"

benefits and costs associated with livestock grazing on federally managed rangelands.

By law, those rangelands are managed for a number of beneficial uses besides livestock grazing. Congress has declared those uses to be beneficial and Congress has required that rangeland program budgets of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management be used, at least in part, to achieve these multiple-use objectives. However, when it comes to justify agency range program costs, the values associated with these nonlivestock grazing benefits often are overlooked, and seldom are counted in the budget justification process. Instead, unnecessary and unfair weight is placed on livestock grazing receipts as the source of funds to pay for nonlivestock range program objectives.

The same sort of naiveté applies to some people's perception and representation of costs incurred by ranchers who graze their cattle and sheep on public rangelands. Many people view the grazing fee as the sole cost incurred by permittees. Nothing could be further from the truth. A 1984 study by the Oregon State University Extension Service shows that grazing fees represent only 15 to 20 percent of the total costs to ranchers of grazing livestock on public rangelands. Nonfee costs are four to five times higher than fee costs. Livestock must be managed and it is the permittees who bear such management costs and the associated risks. Many of the management costs are imposed by government on the private rancher and exist only to satisfy other multiple-use objectives. Some of those imposed costs would not, and do not, exist in private rangeland operations.

THE COST-RECOVERY MYTH

The push for cost recovery is based on two fundamentally erroneous assumptions. It often is assumed that federal agency range management programs exist for only one purpose: to provide forage and habitat for domestic livestock. If this were true, grazing fees would be the appropriate "price" for the sole output produced by the range management program and it would be reasonable to expect fee receipts to cover full costs of administering range programs. The second assumption relates to cost efficiency. It is assumed that the federal agency produces forage and habitat in a cost-efficient manner, i.e., as cheaply as possible. Both assumptions are false.

In the March 1985 draft of the Secretaries Grazing Fee Review and Evaluation Report, it was stated that, in 1983, BLM range management costs per AUM were \$3.17 while Forest Service costs per AUM were \$3.76. These estimates were slightly changed in the Final Report, but neither report reflects the fact that certain range management costs would remain, even if livestock grazing were to be totally for a number of reasons, including remote location, rugged topography, poisonous weeds, predators, etc., and even if one disregards the cost of the permit itself—the price paid by the rancher for the right to graze his livestock on the public rangelands. The higher nonfee cost load on public rangelands has been extensively doc-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

umented (see for example Obermiller and Lambert, "Costs Incurred by Permittees in Grazing Cattle on Public Lands in Various Western States," EM 8283, Oregon State University Extensions Service, 1984).

If the total costs of permittees really were lower, then on the average, financial returns for permittee operations should be higher than financial returns for private rangeland operations. However, there are no available data to suggest that this is the case. In fact, USDA Economic Research Service budgets show financial returns for permittees and nonpermittees to be nearly identical. This is acknowledged in the final report: "The differences in means [averages] shown for the permittees [sic] and the Western Livestock Industry's [receipts and costs] . . . one not statistically different" (p. 62).

Myths die hard. Perhaps the myth of low federal grazing fees that are unfair and inefficient will never die. Be that as it may, it is irresponsible to base national public policy decisions on myths.

MAJOR DEFICIENCIES IN THE FINAL REPORT

The Final Report is better documented than the March 1985 draft report and addresses some of the criticisms we raised in our comments on the draft report last year. However, several substantive problems remain unsolved, partly because faulty decisions were made in the course of the BLM/FS grazing fee review process leading to results that are unalterable and uncorrectable.

For example, the mass appraisal of private grazing land rental transactions in the western states led to a set of data that is incorporated in most of the declared alternatives to the PRIA formula fee system. Other data—specifically, data on the returns and costs incurred by permittees—were not collected even though it is now apparent that such information should have been collected. The agencies were left with a difficult and unresolved dilemma because of their early decision; and regardless of the criticism raised about the mass appraisal, that appraisal data are incorporated in the final report. The western livestock industry remains opposed to any fee system incorporating the results of the defective mass appraisal study.

The other problems previously noted by the western livestock industry still plague the Final Report. These include: (1) development and use of a Proposed "Input Cost Index" (ICI) which substitutes for the PRIA formula "Prices Paid Index" (PPI); and (2) lack of a description of the impacts of competitive bidding, if adopted as an alternative to setting the fee by formula.

THE MASS APPRAISAL: BIG GUN, WRONG TARGET

Suppose that you are the manager of an export business. You are interested in selling bicycles to China. You ask one of your staff members what bicycles sell for in China. The staff member doesn't have any idea, but he knows people use bicycles for transportation. So he goes to various automobile dealers in your neighborhood and gets quotes on new cars. He takes the average from those quotes and tells you that bicycles, in China, are worth \$12,000 apiece. You get very excited, order 1,000 bicycles, ship them to China, and go broke. Sounds like a tall tale, doesn't it? Unfortunately, the parable has a real-life counterpart. Its counterpart is the FS/BLM mass appraisal study.

Decisions are only as good as the information on which they are based. Any decision

based, in part or whole, on the results of the mass appraisal of private grazing land rental transactions is found to be misguided. Why? For starters, virtually no representative information was collected on the value of public land grazing (bicycles in China). And why was that? The response is that, early in the game, a policy decision was made to go another route. Private grazing land rentals were to be appraised instead (automobile prices in the U.S.).

Not only was the appraisal information irrelevant to the question at hand (i.e., what is the value of public lands used for livestock grazing?), the reported appraisal values have little or no scientific credibility. These concerns were voiced in the joint comments of the National Cattlemen's Association, the National Wool Growers Association, and the National Public Lands Council on the "1985 Grazing Fee Review and Evaluation: Draft Report" (April 25, 1985, pages 3-4):

1. No attempt was made to gather information on the actual value (cost) of services provided by lessors and lessees in appraised rental transactions.

2. No attempt was made to appraise the Federal grazing allotments, except for a small number of unrepresentative transactions.

3. Accepted scientific and statistical procedures were not followed in sampling from a defined population.

4. Once the data were collected, portions were thrown out, either by clipping or by relegating to essentially unused subfiles.

5. No attempt was made to verify "comparable-sales" appraisal values using alternative appraisal methods.

6. Many factors affecting the value of Federal permits and public land grazing were "assumed away," such as permit value (debt servicing requirements) and permittee costs for construction and maintenance of improvements on allotments. No attempt were made to gather data on the amount of range improvement investments and maintenance costs that permittees have.

The industry is not alone in its concerns about the merits of the mass appraisal study. Three western university economists, for example, published a formal critique of the government's appraisal report [Nielson et al., "An Evaluation of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Grazing Appraisal Report," Research Report 104, Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, August 1985]. They found the appraisal results to be deficient in three major respects: (1) no information was collected on the differential values of services provided on public versus private grazing lands; (2) no creditable statistical evaluation of private or public grazing land values was conducted; and (3) the government substituted the value judgments of the appraisers themselves for real-world data. Thus, "... the forage values that were estimated in the appraisal report are not valid when judged against the use of scientific methods" (ibid., p. 36).

In short, the appraisal "values" are both useless and irrelevant to the federal grazing fee issue. Any fee alternative incorporating those results is meaningless. Therefore, three of the six fee systems presented in the 1986 Final Report of the Secretaries are not worthy of consideration. These are: (1) Modified PRIA Fee System; (2) Combined Value Fee System; and (3) Modified Market Value Fee System.

THE INDEX QUESTION: MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

Index numbers are used to measure changes in the general level of prices over time. Usually, some base period is chosen to compare with current prices. As a hypothetical example, 1967 could be chosen as the base period for beef cattle prices. If the average price received by ranchers for beef cattle in 1967 was \$25.50 per hundredweight, and the price received in 1978 was \$39.25 per hundredweight, the index of prices for 1978 with a 1967 base could be figured as follows:

$$\$39.25 \div \$25.50 = 1.539$$

Thus, in this hypothetical situation, indexing the value of a 1967 steer (priced at \$255) to determine a 1978 value would be done as follows: $\$255 \times 1.539 = \392.45 .

One must be careful in using index numbers. They only reflect the relative changes in prices and do not reflect changes in the quantity or quality of the item being updated.

The choice of the base period is also extremely important. If prices in the base period chosen are extremely high or low, then any subsequent indexing will be misleading. For example, the 1980-1984 period suggested in the Secretaries' Final Report as a new base period for updating the indices was a time when beef prices (the basis of the Beef Cattle Price Index) were abnormally low and production costs (the basis of the Prices Paid Index) were high. In contrast, the 1964-1968 period used in the PRIA formula was a time when prices and costs were more stable and normal for the western livestock industry.

Significant changes in the "PPI index" are suggested in the final grazing fee report. Therefore, a detailed discussion of this cost index is in order. It appears there is some confusion or difference of opinion as to what this index is or is intended to be. For example, should the prices-paid index represent the cost of doing business on public lands only or the total cost situation on a ranch enterprise?

If the index is intended to reflect the general economic conditions of the ranch business, then one should use as many price items in the index as are applicable to the overall cost of ranching. On the other hand, if the purpose of the index is to reflect the cost (prices paid) of doing business on BLM and Forest Service allotments, then one needs to use those price items that reflect the costs incurred by permittees in utilizing their allotments.

It is our opinion that the inclusion of the cost of production index in the current PRIA formula was intended to reflect the overall, or more general, cost-of-production situation in the ranching industry. The ICI index as proposed in the grazing fee report does not reflect these general costs of production (Figure 3.10 on p. 28). To be consistent with PRIA, an index that covers a broad range of cost items should be used in the fee formula. The National Index of Prices Paid shown in Figure 3.10 of the Final Report is broader in scope than either the "PPI" or the "ICI" and the use of the National Index of Prices Paid could be defended, except perhaps for the inclusion of the Consumer Price Index in this index.

The ICI is also used to update the nonfee cost items derived from the 1966 fee study. We do not believe that the cost index items and their respective weights adequately reflect the changes in the nonfee cost (price) items considered in 1966. For example, we

believe that, with some judgment, indices could be applied to each of the 13 nonfee cost items of 1966 so as to more accurately reflect their changes over time.

Implicit in the concept of updating the nonfee costs and/or the 1966 base fee is the assumption that the nonfee items remain the same today as in 1966, i.e., the same items are applicable today. Also, the concept assumes that the relative magnitude of each item remains the same as in 1966. For example, proper indexing would bring the cost of maintaining 20 miles of fence required to graze a particular allotment up to the present; but indexing would not take into account that the land managing agency now requires maintenance on 35 miles of fence on the same allotment. One should be reminded that those indexes only attempt to keep the prices (cost of wire, posts, labor) at current levels; they do not reflect changes in the quantities (miles of fence) of each cost item.

Let's assume that the Forage Value Index accurately reflects changes in the private grazing market (rents paid for private grazing lands). If this is the case, then each year we re-establish a new fee that keeps the total cost of public and private forage equal. Since the FVI is supposedly influenced by a multitude of market factors that affect the value of grazing, this system could be validly used for many years. The average fee and nonfee cost changes in the private grazing market would be taken care of in the FVI.

But what about the public grazing cost changes? Does indexing of the FVI account for changes in the nonfee costs of grazing permittees on public lands? It is doubtful that relative weight of each of the nonfee items on the public side of the equation have remained constant since 1966. Given the impacts since 1966 of increased environmental requirements, lower agency budgets for range management, changes in the average size of permits, increased maintenance requirements imposed on permittees, and changing industry economics, one would expect that there has been increases in the nonfee costs of grazing permittees. The \$1.23 base (that establishes the nonfee cost differences between grazing permittees and private grazing lessees) probably needs to be updated to get rid of the "old data" image.

However, the method employed in the Secretaries' Final Report (Appendix A, p. 69) to update the \$1.23 base is afflicted with many problems. In addition to those already described above, there is a problem in the use of two different indices to "update" the private lease rate and private nonfee costs.

The Forage Value Index (FVI) is used in the Final Report to update the private lease rate. Thus, the weighted average private lease rate from the 1966 study (\$1.78/AUM) is indexed to a 1980-1984 base period by using the FVI as follows: $\$1.78/\text{AUM} \times 2.16 = \$3.84/\text{AUM}$.

However, a different index, the Input Cost Index (ICI), is used in the Final Report to update nonfee costs for both public and private lessees. In this manner, the Final Report manages to achieve an updated (to a 1980-1984 base period) nonfee cost difference between public and private lessees of only \$1.50/AUM. By subtracting that \$1.50 from the \$3.85 private lease rate that was arrived at as described above, the Final Report comes up with a new base fee of \$2.34/AUM.

The process is illustrated in the figure below.

	Cattle	Sheep
Difference.....	\$1.44	\$1.75
Weighted for numbers.....	$\times .8$	$\times .2$
Total.....	1.15	0.35

Note—Cattle: Public nonfee costs— $\$3.28 \times 2.73 = \$8.95/\text{AUM}$; Private nonfee costs— $\$2.78 \times 2.73 = 7.51$.
Note—Sheep: $\$4.53 \times 2.73 = \$12.37/\text{AUM}$; $3.89 \times 2.73 = 10.62$.

Difference.....	\$1.75
Weighted for numbers.....	.35
Nonfee costs weighted difference.....	1.50
1980-84 private lease rate (per AUM).....	\$3.84
1980-84 difference in nonfee costs.....	1.50
Base fee.....	\$2.34

However, indexing the private lease rate by the FVI and the private nonfee costs by the ICI appears to be double counting. Changes in private nonfee costs should have been reflected in the forage value index.

Also, this illustrates that the choice of the appropriate cost index is a critical decision. If an updated (to the 1980-1984 period) PPI index were used in the above calculation instead of the ICI (3.68 instead of 2.78), the weighted nonfee cost difference would be \$1.94 and the base fee would be \$1.90 instead of \$2.34. Of course, increases in the nonfee costs of permittees since 1966, (which were mentioned above) would have to be deducted from such a \$1.90 base fee, if that base were to be conceptually equal to the \$1.23 base fee in the current PRIA formula.

COMPETITIVE BID FEE SYSTEM

Competitive bidding and free market operation as a fee option has a great appeal to economists, the livestock industry, and the general citizenry alike. This method would circumvent the need for indices, appraisal studies, and other proxies which make vain attempts to estimate market value. In bidding, the private market would establish the going rate for each individual parcel as a function of each parcel's advantages and disadvantages and this would lead to revenue maximization from grazing on federal ranges. However, the competitive bid options presented in the "Grazing Fee Review and Evaluation" are not true competitive bid situations. The report states that if there existed an absence of bidding competition, then a minimum acceptable bid would be imposed. This violates all of the assumptions of the auction bid system and, in essence says that the agencies would like to capture potential economic rent in situations where there is healthy competition but they don't want the flip side of the coin to exist where allotments are scattered, isolated or otherwise have characteristics which diminish the properties' utility.

In economic theory, maximum revenue is obtained by a bidding system. However, there is no basis to assure that revenue maximization for one use is consistent with the goals of multiple use and sustained yield under which the public lands are currently managed. The real world does not lend itself well to such naivete. Market imperfections exist which virtually destroy any merit of the competitive market.

The intermingled nature of western land areas promotes situations where the assumptions of the competitive market are invalid. Problems with controlled access, location of improvements on adjacent deeded or State lands, economics of size and strategic position result in potential monopolistic situations (where only one individual can effectively utilize the allotment) which could

impose drastic deviations from the competitive market price.

Economic ramifications resulting from short-run nature of the competitive lease are many and complicated. The competitive bid could put increased pressure on the lessee to capture short-run revenue from the resource. The competitive price would stimulate little if any incentive for private investment in the long-run productivity of the resource. Lessee responsibility for maintenance would have to be clearly defined. Additional agency manpower would be necessary to assure that short-run liquidity crunches of lessees are not satisfied at the expense of the basic range resource.

There are many bidding possible scenarios which don't favor either the lessee, the lessor, or the resource. For example, that could happen if a current lessee highly dependent upon federal AUMs is outbid for the federal forage, and thereby forced out of business. If the new lessee has overbid for the resource, he, therefore, may eventually be unable to pay the fee and allow the allotment to go unused in subsequent years. The end result would be loss of primary revenue to the U.S. Treasury and losses to the local community of secondary expenditures. However, the federal costs of administering the grazing program would remain basically constant. Such losses, of course, would be in addition to the initial permittee's losses of his equity derived from permit value and his investments in range improvements on the federal lands.

Besides resulting in unused or so-called "vacant" allotments, an equally destabilizing effect of a competitive bidding system would be large fluctuations in transaction prices. Large swings in bid prices would not promote industry stability and would eliminate permit value, thus further reducing the already tenuous financial position of the range livestock industry.

That competitive bidding would result in wide price fluctuations is evident in the record of the bidding system that is used to set the prices for the grazing administered by BLM on the Department of Defense's McGregor Range.

Of course, the sizes of those bids are not directly comparable with the fees or value of the grazing on other public lands, since services and benefits are provided to graziers on the McGregor Range that are not available to graziers on BLM and Forest Service allotments. (The government has a full-time workforce performing maintenance on all water devices, pipelines, traps, fences and corrals on the McGregor Range. The allotments are a constant size and are annually monitored at government expense; and McGregor Range graziers are not required to accommodate other multiple uses or make the investments common on other public grazing lands.)

But while these advantages or values explain why bids for grazing on the McGregor Range should be—and are—generally higher than administered fees, they do not explain why the bids go up and down so drastically each year. Such fluctuations are a tipoff to what could be expected if all parcels or allotments of public lands in the West were put up for bid.

In the 10-year period of 1977-1986, there were six annual increases in bids for grazing on the McGregor Range, with the increases ranging from 10 percent to 38 percent or an average of 24 percent. There were three decreases during the period, ranging from 35 percent to 58 percent, with the average decrease being 43 percent. These figures do

not reflect the allotments that went unused due to lack of bids.

This fiscal year, not only did the annual fee drop from \$8.11/AUM to \$3.46/AUM but there were unused allotments. If these idle AUMs were accounted for, the decrease would be from \$8.11 to \$2.78—a 65 percent decrease in a single year.

Such price variations do little to promote stability in ranching or sound land stewardship. Forward planning by lessees through pro forma cash flow and income statements are virtually impossible when lease prices are so volatile.

There may be another lesson in the McGregor Range situation. The high \$8.11 bid occurred when desperate ranchers in a drought area outbid local ranchers. Today, grazing allotments on BLM and Forest Service allotments are tied to private base property (land or water) and the two form an integral ranching unit (each is dependent upon the other). This is what encourages ranchers to make investments on public lands and to provide wise stewardship of such lands. Even in a 3-year or 10-year bidding system (as discussed in the Final Report), the local rancher would have no assurance that he couldn't be outbid for reasons extrinsic to the value of the forage itself.

CONCLUSION

The revisions of expansions of the original draft which are included in the Final Report do not correct the major conceptual and methodological shortcomings of the draft. The Final Report does not present any changes or fee systems that would result in a more equitable grazing fee. Therefore, the PRIA formula should be continued as the preferred method of annually adjusting federal grazing fees.

BURKINA FASO: AN EMERGING AFRICAN SUCCESS STORY

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the desperate problems of underdevelopment in Africa, and also with the failure of many African governments in dealing with them effectively. Sometimes the causes of failure are related to conditions over which African governments have little control. However, oftentimes they can be traced to those governments, because of corruption, mismanagement, or ill-conceived policies.

Whatever the reasons, we have come to expect failure when we think of Africa. In one corner of the continent, however, there appears to be an emerging success story. Over the last several years, the Government of Burkina Faso has shown that an African government in a poor country with few resources can successfully address some of the most basic needs of its people.

One of the initial successes of the government has been Operation Vaccination Commando, an effort to immunize children against three frequently fatal diseases. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will insert into the RECORD a brief article describing this effort that appeared in "The State of the World's Children 1986," which is published annually by UNICEF.

It does appear that the Government of Burkina Faso is different from many we find throughout the world. Its leaders are not corrupt. They adopted a national plan for development only after extensive discussions with the people. The government sees its role as one of liberating the energies and talents of its people.

Yet, for all of its successes to date, Burkina Faso will receive only \$1 million in United States development aid during the current fiscal year. Admittedly, the United States and Burkina Faso do not always see eye to eye on some of the major political issues debated at the United Nations. It is also true that the Government of Burkina Faso has, at times, displayed excessive zeal in what it conceives to be its revolutionary project.

However, on a continent where failure is endemic, the United States should be more helpful when a government demonstrates that it is not only committed to human development, but is effective in implementing programs that promote it.

[From *The State of the World's Children 1986*]

BURKINA FASO: A VACCINATION COMMANDO

In one three-week period, starting on 25 November 1984, Burkina Faso has vaccinated over a million of its children against measles, yellow fever and meningitis. In the whole of 1981, the health services had immunized only 25,000 of the country's half a million children under two.

No expert would have considered Burkina Faso, formerly Upper Volta, a likely candidate for such an achievement. Desperately poor, beset by fifteen years of drought, it has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world—150 deaths per 1,000 live births. Less than half of the largely rural population lives within reach of a health centre. Over a third of young children are chronically malnourished, leaving them easy prey to the epidemics which sweep the country during the dry season from February to June. The death rate in meningitis outbreaks averages 11%. Measles causes half of all deaths of children between one and four, and in a bad year the tally can go as high as 43,000 cases.

These problems inspired the country's new government to 'Vaccination Commando'—a massive catch-up immunization drive designed to give the health services a respite from the epidemic season, and a breathing-space in which to plan for expanding their regular vaccination coverage.

To spur people's awareness of the value of immunization, Vaccination Commando tackled the diseases best known as killers in Burkina Faso. Vaccines were chosen that are both easy to give and require only one shot for full protection.

On 19 September the Council of Ministers set the date. The National Vaccination Committee, headed by the Director of Public Health, marshalled support from the ministries of education, information, agriculture and defence, and from the vaccination committees set up in every province, district, village and town. UNICEF, the Red Cross and other international agencies, together with other governments, notably China and the Republic of Korea, supplied technical assistance.

The Committees for the Defence of the Revolution (CDRs)—political volunteer groups active in every village, town and work-place—took on the most crucial task of all: mobilizing their communities.

As 25 November neared, CDR members went door to door explaining the benefits of vaccination to parents. They put up posters in schools, bars, and public places all over the country. Roadside billboards announced the campaign; plays about immunization were performed in the villages. The national radio service issued communiqués in all the local languages, urging attendance and broadcasting results as they came in.

When the vaccination posts opened up for business, they were besieged. In some villages the line of parents and children stretched for kilometres, patiently waiting through the day. Families came over the border from neighbouring countries, alerted by their relatives in Burkina Faso. Children came who were over age, under age, and already immunized. Many vaccination posts had to request extra vaccine because far more children turned up than expected: families have been on the move in Burkina Faso, as in all the countries of the drought-stricken Sahel.

The result: in a population of just under 7 million, 62% of children under fifteen are immunized against yellow fever and 64% against meningitis, while the number of under-sixes protected against measles has leapt from 7% to 60%.

Whether this level of coverage can be sustained in the face of all the country's difficulties remains to be seen. But Vaccination Commando has made an impressive beginning. The alliances have been forged to make children's health the concern of everyone. Parents are more aware of what their children gain from vaccination. And Burkina Faso has drawn up plans for introducing primary health care to all its 30 provinces, and immunizing all its under-fives by 1990.

U.S. TRADE AND THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the House Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture of the Committee on Agriculture.

Due to the importance of this issue to U.S. trade and the long-term health of the agricultural community, I am submitting a copy of my testimony for my colleagues consideration:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARK D. SILJANDER BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to testify before the Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to call my colleagues' attention to the export promotion provisions of the 1985 omnibus farm bill, which was signed into law on December 23.

A LOOK AT THE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM'S BEGINNINGS

I am deeply gratified to witness the implementation of export bonus concepts I introduced two years ago. After meeting with members of the European Parliament in January 1984, I was convinced of the need for new direction in U.S. agricultural export

policy. Soon after, I introduced the Agricultural Export Trade Equity Act, which:

Targeted commodities and products that have been adversely affected by foreign export subsidies;

Authorized an export payment-in-kind program that would allow American producers to match the deals offered by the foreign competition;

Encouraged the use of processed and protein-fortified agricultural, value-added products in Public Law 480;

Advocated the use of barter as a means of reducing agricultural surpluses in the U.S.; therefore tying into new markets for U.S. farm products;

Called for the Secretary to ensure that the program did not hurt those American commodities already being sold abroad; and Sought to prevent buyers from reselling their commodities to other countries.

A LOOK AT CURRENT PROMOTION ACTIVITIES

These provisions, for the most part, have been incorporated into the new farm bill. With pressure from Congress and with continual declines in agricultural exports, Secretary Block announced the implementation of an export bonus program, otherwise known as the Export Enhancement Program (EEP). It established as a 3 year program involving \$2 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities. These are to be targeted toward those markets where the United States has lost its competitiveness due to unfair trade practices of other agricultural exporting countries. Recent revisions have mandated that at least \$1 billion be spent on export enhancement projects. Under the program, surplus CCC commodities supplement commercially sold commodities going to specified countries. The most recent count has 6.2 million metric tons announced as being offered in the export bonus program. Eleven countries qualify to participate—Algeria, Egypt, Yemen, Tunisia, Morocco, Turkey, Zaire, Jordan, Philippines, Iraq, and Nigeria. See Table 1 for a status report of the program as of April 8, 1986.

SAVINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROGRAM

With storage and handling costs accumulating at the rate of \$12.40 per metric ton per month for stored CCC grain, the savings realized by the completion of current export enhancement offerings could approach \$100 million. This is a significant savings, given the early stage of the program. I am sure that we'll all look forward to the savings that will be realized by marketing surplus stored grain to develop U.S. agricultural exports.

BARTER INITIATIVES—NEW VISTAS

Pilot barter projects mandated by the new farm bill will provide a launching pad for what I believe to be a new vista in U.S. agricultural trade. Up to this time we have overlooked the vast markets existing within developing countries rich in natural resources we buy. Given the sufficient support by government and the private sector, farm products could become an important aspect in strategic mineral and raw material purchases.

RESPONSE FROM THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

The Export Enhancement Program has been highly criticized by the European Community. While the program's primary purpose has been for the United States to become more competitive in foreign markets eroded by European agricultural exporting practices, EC officials contend that in doing

so, the U.S. has been guilty of unfair trade practices.

A NEW SENSE OF DIRECTION

However, between the export enhancement program and the lowered ASCS loan rates, a very strong message has been sent to the EC. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has become very costly since the U.S. markedly reduced ASCS loan rates, which have functioned as a floor for world grain prices. Europeans are now facing strong pressure to negotiate new agreements in regard to agricultural trade. The relations with former trading partners are being rebuilt. Predatory attacks against our markets are no longer being passively overlooked.

Already, we have seen that EC Commission has announced a proposal calling for a freeze in 1986-87 farm support prices. The strict price proposals reflect the Commission's determination to make the EC's Common Agricultural Policy more market-oriented.

It is encouraging to see how the new farm bill has brought about significant movements toward more freedom in the world agricultural market.

We are facing a new era in the agricultural sector. Competition is keen. Markets are challenging. Technological innovations offer substantial improvements in productivity. With a consistent, reasonable export promotion policy, the U.S. will continue to be the most remarkable producer of food the world has ever known.

TABLE 1. STATUS OF THE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM OF APR. 8, 1986

Country and date announced	Commodity	Amount offered (MT)	Amount purchased under bids accepted through Feb. 28 (MT)
Algeria:			
June 4.....	Wheat.....	1,000,000	¹ 300,000
	xl.....		² 200,000
	Total.....		500,000
Feb. 11.....	Semolina.....	250,000	
Feb. 25.....	Wheat flour.....	100,000	
Apr. 3.....	Eggs.....	³ 500	
Egypt:			
Mar. 21.....	Poultry.....	15,000	
July 2.....	Wheat flour.....	600,000	⁴ 175,000
July 26.....	Wheat.....	500,000	⁵ 500,000
Oct. 30.....	Wheat.....	500,000	
Yemen:			
Aug. 20.....	Wheat flour.....	50,000	30,000
Sept. 6.....	Wheat.....	100,000	
Morocco:			
Sept. 30.....	Wheat.....	1,500,000	¹ 260,000
	xl.....		² 500,000
	Total.....		760,000
Turkey: Oct. 16.....	Wheat.....	500,000	² 500,000
Jordan:			
Mar. 19.....	Wheat.....	75,000	
Nov. 8.....	Rice.....	40,000	
Philippines: Nov. 15.....	Wheat flour.....	100,000	⁴ 50,000
Zaire: Nov. 18.....	Wheat flour.....	64,000	⁴ 30,000
Iraq:			
Apr. 2.....	Dairy cattle.....	⁶ 6,500	
Dec. 9.....	Wheat flour.....	150,000	⁴ 37,500
Nigeria: Dec. 10.....	Barley malt.....	100,000	
Zaire: Dec. 27.....	Wheat.....	40,000	
Philippines: Jan. 6.....	Wheat.....	150,000	
Tunisia: Mar. 18.....	Wheat.....	300,000	

¹ Soft red winter wheat.

² Hard red winter wheat.

³ Millers.

⁴ Flour not in grain equivalent.

⁵ Heads.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture. Foreign Agricultural Service. Foreign Agriculture Circular, Grains.

INSIDERS

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the golden fleece for flaunting Government service has two deserving winners: David Stockman and Michael Deaver.

They are not the first to trade on former Government service to advance new careers outside of Government. Plenty of Democrats and Republicans alike have done that in recent years.

What sets Deaver and Stockman apart is the verve, aplomb, and sheer arrogance with which they have cashed high level Government positions into seven-figure wealth.

I believe that a recent article by Robert Samuelson clearly exposed the folly and shame of "Insider Status and Insider Stories." (The article from the May 7, 1986, Washington Post follows.)

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1986]

INSIDER STATUS AND INSIDER STORIES

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

In the Reagan administration, few people seemed less alike than David Stockman and Michael Deaver. Stockman, head of the Office of Management and Budget, was the proverbial whiz kid who mastered the intricacies of government programs. Deaver was the president's public relations maestro, who couldn't have cared less about government policy. But when they left government, they acted alike: They turned their years in government into mounds of money. Stockman published an insider's account of the White House, and Deaver opened his own lobbying firm.

What happened to public service? There is something here beyond greed. The common denominator between Stockman and Deaver is an attitude that their time in government is properly exploited for personal gain. You detect no sense of embarrassment. The idea that people go into government—or ought to—for some broader good was absent. Nor did they apparently expect anyone to think otherwise. It's this obliviousness that's most troubling, for it embodies a cynicism that may reflect popular attitudes.

Government—everything from caring for the national parks to regulating nuclear reactors to collecting taxes—is ultimately about public service. Government can't compete for talented, motivated workers entirely on the basis of money; private companies almost always will be able to pay more. What brings and keeps good people in government is the sense that what they're doing is important for society. Once we lose that core concept, we condemn ourselves to mediocre government.

If what Deaver and Stockman did were isolated incidents, they could be dismissed. But they aren't. Government—and, by extension, the people who work for it—increasingly invites popular ridicule. In 1976 and 1980, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan campaigned in part against Washington bureaucrats. Government workers received no pay increase for 1985, and the 1980s budget debates have made it more difficult for many agencies to do their jobs well. Congress doesn't approve final spending levels

well into the budget year; the uncertainty bedevils planning.

These actions betray an undercurrent of contempt for competent government. A friend in government—a career official who could make two or three times on the outside what he now does—warns against over-generalizing. "It's hard to tell whether working for the government doesn't have the status it used to," he said. "It differs so much from office to office, from department to department. My sense is that a lot of people still go into government because they really like the work."

The point is well taken. Anyone who has lived in Washington even a few months knows that the quality—and usefulness—of government varies enormously. Some agencies deserve all the pejorative labels of bureaucracy. They're rigid, inefficient, complacent and insensitive. But elsewhere, you find islands of energy, dedication, talent and hard work. A lot of maligned bureaucrats regularly work 9- and 10-hour days.

It's also true that government is going through a period of inevitable trauma. Even competent government may not be good government if it's unwanted. The debates over budget deficits symbolize a reexamination of what we want government to do. Our desire for government has collided with our tolerance to be taxed, and something will have to give. Just because programs once appeared worthwhile doesn't mean they are today. Government is like a depressed industry facing pressures for change; the effect is demoralizing.

One other qualification is warranted: What Deaver and Stockman did was not unique. Government's revolving door has revolved for decades. The current *National Journal*—a magazine devoted to government—lists dozens of former top officials in Democratic and Republican administration who stayed in Washington to lobby. And similar problems exist at less rarefied levels. Tax attorneys learn their trade working for the government, then leave for more lucrative private practice. Many other specialists do the same. The ethical issues are slippery. What else does a tax attorney do but practice tax law?

But, accepting these qualifications, the Deaver-Stockman performance is still troubling. It is not just that they used government service for personal gain. They flaunted it. There was no sense of self-restraint. Our top government officials ought to set a higher standard of behavior. But Deaver and Stockman provided a lower standard. Their idea of public service, apparently, is something that can be taken to the bank.

Stockman's case is particularly curious. As budget director, he labored tirelessly and honorably. Whether or not you agreed with him, he had an obvious interest in better government. But his message now is: If you're smart and can make more on the outside, you're a fool to stay in government. The parallel with Deaver may seem strained, but it isn't. Each used what he had—insider status for Deaver and insider stories for Stockman—and rushed to maximize its value. Would Stockman's book have fetched an advance exceeding \$2 million if published in, say, 1988?

We cannot expect to attract good people into government unless the people who head government create a climate of dignity and respect. In the private economy, companies survive or fail on profits. In government, the ultimate motive to do well is a sense of a larger social usefulness. The worthiness of public service is a concept that

must be conveyed from the top. If Ronald Reagan and those around him have been sending that message, it's been easy to miss.

LEGAL SERVICES AND EDGAR AND JEAN CAHN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, what makes our Nation unique is that we are a government of laws, not men. Our Constitution promises that every American—whether rich or poor, privileged or powerless—stands equal before the law. We look to the law to mediate our conflicts, to be impartial. It is the vehicle for American justice.

Unfortunately, not everyone in our country has equal access to our judicial system. Too often the poor and the needy and the uninformed do not have the available resources to exercise their legal rights. For them the American model of justice is little more than an abstract right.

That is why Legal Services Corporation is so important to our Nation. Legal Services was created to provide funds for the delivery of civil legal services for the poor. By providing access to our judicial system, it helps make our national promise of equal justice for all a reality. Today, the Legal Services Corporation lives on, despite this administration's annual attempts to eliminate it.

Recently, the Legal Services Corporation observed its 10th anniversary, which was commemorated at a conference last December of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. One of the speakers at the conference was Edgar S. Cahn, a long-time leader in the legal services movement and a cofounder of Antioch Law School. He and his wife Jean wrote the original paper published in the *Yale Law Journal* which gave rise to the idea of a legal services program for the poor.

I would like to share what Mr. Cahn had to say at that conference. His words are moving and eloquent, from a poem he and his wife wrote. Mr. Cahn's words remind us of the spirit that created the Legal Services program, and the spirit that has kept it alive ever since:

FOR THE RECORD

The Dream—The Dream that started it all—
was not about lawyers.

It was about Justice.

This I affirm.

And the Justice of which we dreamed—you,
I, all of us—that Justice was larger
than the law, larger than legal wrongs
and legal remedies.

It was about this Land and the Promise of
this Land.

This too I can affirm.

And that promise—it was not something
afar off—vague and abstract. No. In
the words of Deuteronomy, "it was
very close at hand."

Covenant That Bound Each of Us:

To Protect the Weak

To Make Whole the Injured

To Respect the Dreams of Others

And the Right of Others to Dream In Their
Own Way

This too I affirm.

These are not fashionable sentiments.
They are not adequately Darwinian.
They do not even state quantifiable outputs.
But they are what I would affirm today—
As Historical Past
As an Obligatory Future.

And above all, tonight, as a collective destiny
in which you and I have been privileged
to share

We Few, We Happy Few—
And—in the generic sense—
We Band of Brothers.

—Edgar S. and Jean Camper Cahn

NATIONAL OSTEOPOROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that this week, May 11-17, has been designated as "National Osteoporosis Awareness Week." It is fitting that we begin this important week with Mother's Day in an effort to encourage grandmothers, mothers, and daughters to pay special attention to this serious problem which afflicts so many women. We have the opportunity to bring to national awareness information on a disease that disables and kills thousands each year.

During this week, activities are underway all across the country to educate men and women about this devastating disease. Let me give you a few examples.

At the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Lawrence E. Shulman, the Director of the Division of Arthritis, Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases has prepared a public service announcement which will be aired on numerous radio stations throughout the country. This will be done in conjunction with the release of an important 32-page booklet on osteoporosis entitled, "Osteoporosis: Cause, Treatment, Prevention." At the same time, the National Dairy Board will produce a videotape on calcium and osteoporosis to be shown in May at the convention of Women in Radio and Television.

In San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, Oklahoma City, and several other major cities, forums will be held on osteoporosis, its detection and prevention. Denver is offering a city-wide screening for osteoporosis using a densitometer, a machine which measures bone density. In Wisconsin, a massive educational effort has been launched in 71 counties throughout the State to develop information and awareness of osteoporosis. Oklahoma City is sponsoring public service announcements, while in Seattle a newly formed 60-member osteoporosis support group is planning a public service announcement for television.

In Dallas, physicians have asked dairy producers in their area to print risk factors for osteoporosis on milk cartons and they have also convinced a pharmacy chain to distribute a list of risk factors to its patrons. On May 12, the New York chapter of the National Osteoporosis Foundation will be hosting a luncheon seminar for prominent women in that region.

Throughout the Washington metropolitan area, buses will display ads about osteoporosis and the commemorative week. Georgetown University is planning a conference the morning of May 17, entitled "Inside Look at Osteoporosis," which will include a risk factor evaluation. And on the Washington Mall, a 1 to 5 mile "Fun Walk" is scheduled for the same day at 8 a.m. in order to underscore the importance of weight-bearing exercise in the prevention and control of this disease. In addition to all these activities, the National Osteoporosis Foundation will be celebrating its first anniversary. This foundation promises to develop into a major presence in the field of osteoporosis.

While osteoporosis affects between 15 and 20 million individuals in the United States alone, relatively few American women know about this disease. For that reason, by designating "National Osteoporosis Awareness Week," we can focus attention on this serious problem.

Through an active education program we can reduce the incidence of pain, deformity, disability, and expenditures associated with osteoporosis. Let this week be the beginning of an educational campaign that will ultimately add osteoporosis to the list of those diseases which no longer are a threat to our society.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 5, 1986, I had the privilege of addressing the entire student body of the Log College Junior High School in Warminster, Bucks County, PA.

Mr. Speaker, as I told the students at Log College, Americans between the ages of 5 and 34 are more likely to be killed in a traffic accident than any other single cause. Alcoholism is involved in at least half of those fatal crashes. For the young person who is driving a light truck or van, their chance of death as a result of drinking while driving is even higher.

In fact, in 1982 over 70 percent of fatally injured drivers of light trucks and vans had been drinking, 62 percent of these drivers were at legally intoxicated levels. While death from drinking while driving is obviously not limited to young people, they suffer disproportionately. It is the leading cause of death for teenagers accounting for 45 percent of all their deaths.

Not all of those young people killed in highway accidents were drinking, but 60 percent of the fatally injured teenage drivers were found to have been drinking prior to the crash and 43 percent were at legally intoxicated levels.

The students at Log College Junior High School, Mr. Speaker, are determined in their own way to do something about this national tragedy. They have joined with other students from across America in forming a chapter of SADD—Students Against Driving Drunk.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, SADD began in 1981 in Massachu-

setts. Since then, over 7,000 chapters in junior high schools and high schools across America have been formed to face one of the Nation's most serious problems. If schools throughout our congressional districts and across our country would follow the example set this week by the students at Log College Junior High School, we could save the lives of countless young men and women before it is too late.

In my State, Mr. Speaker, we have taken a step in that direction. The General Assembly of the Commonwealth has passed and the Governor has signed a tough, new law aimed at those who drive while drinking. The new law went into effect in January 1983 and requires a mandatory 48-hour, 30-day or 90-day jail sentence and up to a 12-month license suspension for those convicted of first, second and third time drunk driving offenses, respectively.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania law now calls for an automatic 1-year suspension of one's driving license for refusing to take a test to determine the presence of alcohol and the admission of such refusals in evidence in court. This tough new law signed by Governor Dick Thornburgh is making a difference on the highways of the Commonwealth. Preliminary estimates indicate an 11.8 percent decline in the number of alcohol-related traffic fatalities during the first year of Pennsylvania's new law—saving the lives of 96 citizens, 17 of them teenagers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Dr. Harry L. Clark, the principal of Log College Junior High School and Ms. Judith Michael, the faculty adviser to SADD.

Let me pay a special tribute to the young people who founded the chapter as well. Its officers are: president, Marc Bailkin; vice president, Kelly Candrella; secretary, Tracey Bittner; treasurer, Chris Mooney; and coordinator, Jen Fassbender.

A TRIBUTE TO THE COW NECK PENINSULA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Cow Neck Peninsula Historical Society as they celebrate the inclusion of their headquarters, the Sands-Willets Homestead, on the State and National Registry of Historic Places.

The Sands-Willets house has long played an important role in the history and development of Port Washington, NY. Until its purchase by the Cow Neck Peninsula Historical Society the house has been continuously occupied for approximately 250 years by two prominent civic minded families.

In the late 1600's, John Sands bought the land on which the Sands-Willets house was built. This acreage was given to his eldest son, John Sands II, who lived there from 1712 on. The earliest portion of the house dates from this period. Revolutionary War hero John Sands IV and his six brothers were born in the

house. All went on to make major contributions to the Revolutionary War effort and to the growth of our young country.

In 1846, members of the Sands family sold the homestead to Edmund Willets, a New York merchant and prominent Quaker. The homestead remained a working farm well into the 20th century. In 1967, the estate of Eliza Willets, Edmund's granddaughter, sold the House to the Cow Neck Peninsula Historical Society.

The house remains today a textbook example of the development of architecture in this area of Long Island over a long period of time. It features both an early Dutch influence and a Greek revival style making the structure a living example to be studied by students of historical architecture.

The old homestead serves as a constant reminder of the rich history of this part of Long Island as well as the important role played by two prominent Port Washington families in that history. It gives me great pleasure to be able to share the history of the Sands-Willets house with my colleagues on this occasion, and I congratulate the Cow Neck Peninsula Historical Society for its efforts to preserve an important facet of the history of Long Island.

THREE ARIZONA SCHOOLS WIN HIGH HONORS

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues three schools in the Fifth District of Arizona which have recently received honorable awards.

I am very proud to announce the victory of the University High School chess team of Tucson, AZ, in the 1986 National Chess Team Championships in King of Prussia, PA. It was during the final round of play that the team pulled away from their competition to take first place honors. The five-member team—senior Liz Neely, junior Clark Allen, sophomore Adam Colby, freshman Robby Adamson, and freshman Ross Colby—scored a total of 22 points during the 3-day competition—a large two-point margin above the second place team. Placing fourth nationally last year and first in Arizona, I am sure we'll be seeing more of the University High School chess team in the years to come. Congratulations.

Following the theme "We Can Make a Difference," Flowing Wells High School was named the best high school in the State of Arizona for 1986. In the junior high and middle school competition, Amphitheater Junior High proudly accepted the second place honor. A 33-member citizen team, the Arizona Secondary Recognition Program, chose Flowing Wells and Amphitheater based on the schools' student achievement, academic, and behavioral goals, curriculum, and community and parent support and involvement. These schools are representative of the best in Arizona education. As the representative from District Five, I am extremely proud to send a warm congratu-

lations to the students, faculty, staff, and parents of both Flowing Wells and Amphitheater.

SIBENIK, YUGOSLAVIA, HOSPITAL'S "BREAD OF LIFE"—A FUNDRAISER FOR AN INFANT RESPIRATOR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 a one-time dinner-dance will be held at the Yugoslav American Club of San Pedro, CA, in order to raise funds for the purchase of a badly-needed infant respirator for Yugoslavia's Sibenik Hospital. This affair, which has my full support, is appropriately referred to as Sibenik's "Breath of Life."

Sibenik, which is located on the beautiful Adriatic coastline, is formerly the home of many Yugoslav-Americans who now reside in and around San Pedro.

Today, when a premature baby is born in Sibenik, he or she must be transported to a larger hospital in Split or Zagreb because Sibenik's hospital simply does not have the technology and equipment necessary to help them breathe. Needless-to-say, premature babies would be given a much better chance of survival if Sibenik's hospital acquired and utilized the appropriate equipment, that is respirators, necessary to sustain life.

Mr. Speaker, as you can well understand, the birth of a baby is truly a special moment. A premature baby, however, must fight for every breath and struggle to stay alive. And, unfortunately, if the necessary medical equipment is unavailable, this baby's chance of survival is severely diminished. This is why it is vital that all hospitals acquire these very special respirator machines which allow premature babies to breathe until they are capable of breathing on their own.

My wife, Lee, joins me in commending those who will participate in this special event which will give babies in Sibenik a real fighting chance of survival.

ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AND VIOLENCE IN OUR COUNTRY

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable NORMAN Y. MINETA, and I have distributed among the membership of the House of Representatives, copies of a report, prepared by the Japanese American Citizens League, which identifies and analyzes the unfortunate and alarming rise in anti-Asian sentiment and violence in our country. We believe that it is a story that must be told.

Few people are aware of the heritage of Americans of Asian ancestry. Until the 1950's, Asian immigrants were subject to discriminatory laws, excluding them from citizenship, land ownership, and intermarriage. Not many people know that the 100th/442d Regimental

Combat Team, a segregated unit of Japanese-Americans, was the most decorated unit in American military history for its size and length of service.

It is our belief that the recent rise of anti-Asian sentiment and violence is at least in part rooted in ignorance.

As the JACL report documents, this ignorance has frequently tainted public debate and public perceptions. In many instances, the debate over an economic issue, such as the deficit between the United States and her trading partners, becomes characterized as a racial issue.

Sometimes this ignorance leads to violence. The extreme example is the instance of workers who blamed the loss of their jobs on our foreign trading partners, then transferred their rage to a young American of Chinese ancestry and bludgeoned him to death.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we can make a positive and lasting contribution to increasing public understanding of Americans of Asian ancestry and all of America's new citizens. By remaining thoughtful and vigilant during the coming deliberations over trade matters, we can ensure that an economic problem does not become a racial problem.

IN HONOR OF THE TROY TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to honor the Troy School District in Troy, MI, and the teachers in that district who have been selected as "Teacher of the Year."

On Wednesday evening, 12 outstanding professionals will be honored for the excellent work they do each and every day. Three will be honored as "Teacher of the Year" and nine will be honored as "Honor Roll Candidates," or finalists. The teachers of the year are: Cynthia Kolesar, who teaches kindergarten at Wattles Elementary School; Hedy Blatt, who teaches vocal, drama, and speech at Baker Middle School; and Heston Bates, who teaches science at Troy High School. The honor roll candidates are: Vivian Dunn, Susan McMacken, Diane Russell, Roy K. Downie, Mary Ann Pontiatowski, Eileen Schmidt, Joseph Brandonisio, Chuck Griffith, and Sharon Myers.

Knowing of the great number of talented and caring teachers in the Troy School District who help students to learn and grow, I am sure the selection of these few was not easy. That they were selected, however, indicates their outstanding dedication to our children. These teachers face the constant challenge of inquiring minds with the knowledge that each child is unique, and each situation demands a different approach. We are truly fortunate to have these remarkable men and women devote their energies and talents to the enrichment of our community.

I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the importance of education by honoring these richly deserving teachers of the Troy School District.

THE 98TH BIRTHDAY OF IRVING BERLIN

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1986

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 an authentic American genius, Mr. Irving Berlin, celebrated his 98th birthday. I want to take a moment to extend my warmest congratulations to this wonderful man and to thank him for the magnificent contributions he has made to our musical heritage.

Irving Berlin wrote some of the most popular songs in the country for three different generations of Americans and many of these are absolutely great songs that will last forever.

His first song, "Marie From Sunny Italy," was written in 1907 and by 1911, with "Alexander's Ragtime Band," Irving Berlin was an international celebrity. In 1916 he collaborated with Victor Herbert on his first Broadway musical. He wrote a number of musical reviews in the 1920's, including the music for the Marx Brothers production, "The Cocoanuts." Beginning in the 1930's Irving Berlin set the standard for movie musicals. His film "Top Hat," with Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire, gave us the song "Isn't This a Lovely Day." "White Christmas," another Berlin classic, came from the movie "Holiday Inn."

On Broadway, "Annie Get Your Gun" and "Call Me Madam" were written by Irving Berlin in the 1940's and are among the best of our musical plays.

All of this was accomplished by a man who grew up on New York's lower East Side in a desperately poor family. His father died when he was 8 and his formal education was limited to only 2 years. He has never learned to read music but what a talent he has. His music has enriched the lives of millions, and it is apparent from everything he has done that he has tremendous love and respect for this country. Everyone knows that he wrote "God Bless America" but most probably do not know that he gave the royalties from this extremely popular song to the Boy Scouts and Girls Scouts. Irving Berlin is a truly remarkable man and I am delighted to be able to wish him a very happy birthday.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily

May 12, 1986

Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 13, 1986, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 14

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on the effect of exchange rate volatility and the debt problems of developing countries on U.S. trade competitiveness, and related provisions of Title V of S. 1860, proposed Trade Enhancement Act.

SD-538

*Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Legal Services Corporation, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1860, proposed Trade Enhancement Act of 1985, and related measures, including S. 1865 and S. 1837, focusing on authority for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations.

SD-215

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the Federal Election Commission, S. Con. Res. 123, to permit the 1986 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol grounds, S. 2272, to limit the amount that may be expended in any fiscal year by a Member of Congress for franked mail, S. 2255, to prohibit the expenditures of Federal funding for Congressional newsletters, H. Con. Res. 288, to authorize the printing of additional copies of a certain committee print, H. Con. Res. 301, to authorize the printing of additional copies of a certain Presidential Message, and pending administrative business.

SR-301

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.

SD-138

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on H.R. 2403, to require that public buildings constructed or altered under the Public Buildings Act shall be in compliance with nationally recognized building codes and State and local zoning laws, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for public buildings program of the General Services Administration.

SD-406

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-419

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 525, to provide for the transfer to the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority of the Secretary of Energy to conduct epidemiological studies of radiation effects.

SD-342

Governmental Affairs
Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1327, to establish higher minimum rates of basic pay in geographic areas where the Federal Government is experiencing significant recruitment and retention problems, S. 1727, to establish alternative personnel management systems for scientific and technical employees, and provisions of S. 2082, to improve the management of major defense acquisition programs, to establish a Defense Acquisition Service, and to limit employment contacts between senior officials of the Department of Defense and defense contractors.

SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2312, to revise certain provisions of title VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, relating to armed career criminals, to include a serious drug offense and any crime of violence as an offense subject to enhanced penalties.

SD-226

11:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 2372, the Financial Institutions Emergency Acquisitions Amendments of 1986.

SD-538

1:30 p.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1860, proposed Trade Enhancement Act of 1985, and related measures, including

S. 1869, focusing on the protection of intellectual property rights.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

3:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 2230 and S. 2142, bills to improve financial management in the Federal Government and reduce the Federal Budget deficit.

SD-342

3:30 p.m.
Conferees
On H.R. 2005, to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).

2123 Rayburn Building

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on the nominations of Marvin Duncan, of Missouri, and Frank W. Naylor, Jr., of Virginia, each to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration.

SR-332

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the affordability and availability of liability insurance for local governments, housing industries, and transit systems.

SD-538

Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2083, to promulgate regulations for asbestos hazard abatement in the Nation's schools, and S. 2300, to set standards for identification and abatement of hazardous asbestos in Federal and other buildings.

SD-406

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1860, proposed Trade Enhancement Act of 1985, and related measures, including S. 1868, focusing on procedures for determining dumping by nonmarket economy countries.

SD-215

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2197, to establish an optional early retirement program for Federal Government employees.

SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2050, to notify workers who are at risk of occupational disease in order to establish a system for identifying and preventing illness and death of such workers.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on AIDS testing and research policy in the Department of Defense.

SD-192

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of State, focusing on voluntary contributions to international organizations programs, and for the Office of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations.

SD-124

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on funding levels for research programs of the National Science Foundation.

SD-253

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine issues related to the 1984 Protocols Amending the Civil Liability and Fund Conventions on Oil Pollution Damage (Treaty Doc. 99-12), which establish a liability limit on tanker owners for damage caused by oil from their vessels.

SD-419

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2256, to remove certain requirements relating to reservations of funds for special alternative instructional programs and transitional bilingual educational programs.

Room to be announced

11:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to review the possible impact on agriculture of the explosion of the Soviet nuclear powerplant at Chernobyl.

SR-332

1:00 p.m.

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To resume hearings in closed session to examine legal mechanisms to combat terrorism.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Business meeting, to mark up H.R. 4515, making urgent supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1986 for the Federal Government.

SD-192

Finance

To hold hearings on the nomination of Dorcas R. Hardy, of California, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

SD-215

Judiciary

Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the prosecution of Soviet Embassy demonstrators.

SD-226

4:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

MAY 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nominations of Vice Admiral Paul A. Yost, Jr., to be Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of admiral, and Rear Admiral James C. Irwin, to be Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral.

SR-253

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the progress of this year's refugee resettlement program, and on the Administration's proposed regional refugee admissions level for fiscal year 1987.

SD-226

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the government-approved release of genetically engineered organisms.

SD-406

10:15 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Maritime Commission.

SR-253

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2204, to permit the use of park entrance, admission and recreation use fees for the operation of the National Park System.

SD-366

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1302, proposed Natural Gas Regulatory Reform Act of 1985, S. 1251, proposed Natural Gas Utilization Act of 1985, S. 2205, to eliminate certain restrictions on the use of natural gas and petroleum, S. 2285 to promote competition in the natural gas market, to ensure open access to transportation services, to encourage production of natural gas, to provide natural gas consumers with adequate supplies at reasonable prices and to eliminate demand restraints, and S. 834, to increase competition in the transportation of natural gas.

SD-366

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

Environment and Public Works

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2405, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1987-1990 for the Federal-aid highway program.

SD-406

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to review the results of the Economic Summit and the implementation of the Baker plan designed to meet the global debt crisis.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-192

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the U.S. Information Agency, and the National Endowment for Democracy.

S-146, Capitol

Judiciary

To resume hearings on S. 2160 and S. 2022, bills to clarify and improve the analysis of mergers under the anti-trust laws.

SD-226

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on strategies to reduce hunger in America.

SD-430

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on certain issues resulting from a decision of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of the Ute Indian Tribe v. the State of Utah.

SD-538

MAY 29

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Office of the Secretary and Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

JUNE 3

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (P.L. 95-617).

SD-366

May 12, 1986

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

10351

Finance
To hold hearings on S. 2331, to assure the quality of inpatient hospital services and post-hospital services furnished under the Medicare program, and related matters.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on statistical policy for an aging America.
SD-342

JUNE 4

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and certain related agencies.
SD-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1935, to provide for certain vessels to be documented under the laws of the United States to entitle them to engage in domestic coastwise trade.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings to review the imposition of user fees in FDA approval procedures for new drugs.
SD-430

JUNE 5

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (P.L. 95-617).
SD-366

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Institute of Museum Services.
SD-192

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on ozone depletion, the greenhouse effect, and climate change.
SD-406

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on ozone depletion, the greenhouse effect, and climate change.
SD-406

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on efforts to improve the health status of children.
SD-430

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act.
SR-253

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 830, to expand Indian education programs to include Native Hawaiians.
SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume joint oversight hearings with the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on illiteracy in America.
2175 Rayburn Building

JUNE 17

9:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1235 and S. 2291, bills to promote more effective and efficient nuclear licensing and regulation.
SD-406

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2055, to establish the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on S. 1804, to establish a program to provide development and incentive grants to States for enacting medical malpractice liability reforms.
SD-430

Select on Indian Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 902, to establish Federal standards for gaming activities on Indian lands.
SD-106

JUNE 18

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

JUNE 25

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the administration of the Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.
SD-430

JULY 17

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Social Security and Income Maintenance Programs Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity on work and welfare issues.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Finance's Subcommittee on Social Security and Income Maintenance Programs on work and welfare issues.
SD-430

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Social Security and Income Maintenance Programs Subcommittee
To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity on work and welfare issues.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Finance's Subcommittee on Social Security and Income Maintenance Programs on work and welfare issues.
SD-430

JULY 29

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the response for home health care services.
SD-430

JULY 30

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

AUGUST 13

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to review the private sector initiatives in human services.
SD-430

SEPTEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to review the human resources impact on drug research and space technology.
SD-430

10352

SEPTEMBER 16

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-430

SEPTEMBER 24

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1987 for the intelligence community.
SH-219

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings to review the services trade between the United States and Japan.
SD-419

MAY 14

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2422, to provide a cost-of-living increase for fiscal year 1987 in the rates of veterans' disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children, S. 2168, to improve veterans' benefits for former prisoners of war, S. 2304, to extend the period of time during which veterans readjustment appointments may be made, and provisions of S. 2186, S. 2187, and related measures, to exempt any amounts available to provide certain benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities from any requirement for sequestration of funds

May 12, 1986

under part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
SR-418

MAY 15

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To resume hearings on the reported sightings of live military personnel missing in action in Southeast Asia.
SD-628

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Natural Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on prospects for exporting American coal.
SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for fossil energy and clean coal technology.
SD-192